

### REMARKS

Claims 1-96 are pending. Claims 27-96 are withdrawn from consideration due to unselected inventions.

#### Rejection of claims 1 and 16

Independent claims 1 and 16 were rejected under 102(b) as being anticipated by Doherty (US pat. 6,201,521). This rejection is traversed because it is respectfully submitted that Doherty does not teach or suggest all features of each of claims 1 and 16.

For example, each of claims 1 and 16 expressly recites, among other features, a step of transforming the received pixel data streams into a set of bitplane data streams such that the bitplane data streams representing the pixels of the same subgroup are parallel and adjacent (claim 1) or interleaved (claim 16) (emphasis added). In comparison, Doherty is directed to a method of addressing a spatial light modulator using bitplane data. In column 2, line s 31-35, Doherty briefly mentions that the received pixel data is formatted to bitplane data. However, Doherty does not teach or suggest a method of how to format or transform pixel data into bitplane data, much less *teach or suggest the feature of transforming the pixel data into bitplane data such that the bitplane data streams representing the pixels of the same subgroup are parallel and adjacent.*

In the Response to the Argument section of the Office Action, the Examiner contended that *"Doherty teaches, as shown in Figure 3, that the pixels in each of the groups 0 to 14 are parallel and adjacent. As known in the art, in a matrix display device, the rows are parallel to each other and the columns are also parallel to each other;"* and such teaching teaches the above features in claim 1 and 16. The undersigned agree on the first part about Doherty and the common knowledge. However, the above-mentioned features set forth in pending claim 1 and claim 16 are not physical pixels, *but are bitplane data streams; and the bitplane data representing the pixels of the same subgroup are parallel and adjacent (claim 1) or interleaved (claim 16).* Bitplane arrangements and physical pixel arrangements are completely different concepts.

Moreover, each of claims 1 and 16 recites, still among other features that the pixels of each row of the array are divided into a plurality of subgroups, and the bitplane data streams representing the pixels of the same subgroup are parallel and adjacent. In comparison, Doherty divides the rows of the array into subgroups (and the corresponding bitplane data). Doherty does not divide pixels of each row into subgroups as recited in claim 1 or claim 16.

In the Response to the Argument section of the Office Action, the Examiner contended that *"the device of Doherty meets this limitation since all of the pixels (from row 0 to row 479, therefore, meets the limitation of "pixels of each row of the array" of the array in the device of Doherty are divided into a plurality of subgroups 0 to 14;"* and such teaching teaches the above features in claim 1 and 16. The undersigned can not agree. As set forth in claim 1 and claim 16, the pixels of each row of the array are divided into a plurality of subgroups, but not the rows of the array being divided into subgroups. As discussed and illustrated in Doherty, the rows of the array are divided into subgroups, while the pixels in each row are not divided into subgroups. For clarifying the difference, claim 1 and 16 each are amended. After the amendments, claim 1 and claim 16 each explicitly comprises, among other features, dividing the pixels of each row of the array into a plurality of subgroups such that at least two pixels in said each row are in different sub-groups.

Because Doherty fails in teaching or suggesting all features of each of claims 1 and 16, claims 1 and 16, as well as claims 2-15 depending from claim 1, and claims 17-26 depending from claim 16, are patentable over Doherty. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are respectfully requested. In the event any fees are required in connection with this paper, please charge the Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregory R. Muir". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Gregory" being more prominent and the last name "Muir" following in a similar style.

MUIR IP LAW GROUP  
560 S Winchester Blvd., Suite 500  
San Jose, CA 95128  
Fax: (408) 521-2060

Gregory R. Muir  
Attorney for Applicants,  
Registration No. 35,293  
Tel: (408) 918-3085